

### **REMARKS / ARGUMENTS**

The present application includes pending claims 1-17, all of which have been rejected. The Applicant respectfully submits that the claims define patentable subject matter.

Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-13, and 15-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S.P.P. 2004/0131109 ("Kim"). Claims 4, 9, and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of U.S.P.P. 2003/0123586 ("Yen"). Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of U.S.P.P. 2004/0125884 ("Wei"). The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections at least based on the following remarks.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

#### **I. Kim Does Not Anticipate Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-13, and 15-16**

The Applicant first turns to the rejection of claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-13, and 15-16 under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Kim. With regard to the anticipation rejections under 102, MPEP 2131 states that "[a] claim is anticipated only if **each and every element** as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." See Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) at 2131 (internal citation omitted). Furthermore, "[t]he identical invention must

be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.” See *id.* (internal citation omitted).

Without conceding that Kim qualifies as a prior art reference under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), the Applicant traverses the rejection as follows.

**A. Rejection of Independent Claims 1, 6, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

With regard to the rejection of independent claim 1 under 102(e), the Applicant submits that Wang does not disclose or suggest at least the limitation of “removing post cursor inter-symbol interference **within at least one error correction code word** in a block code based error correction scheme,” as recited by the Applicant in independent claim 1 (emphasis added).

The Office Action states the following:

As per claim 1, Kim et al teaches a method for equalization in a communications system, the method comprising: Decision feedback equalizer that is used for *removing post cursor inter-symbol interference* (See *fig.1 b element 16 and abstract and paragraph [0016-0017]*) *within at least one error correction code word in a block code based error correction scheme* (see *fig.1.b element 92 and paragraphs [0024] and [0046-53]* and page 7, lines 27-30); wherein said block code based error correction scheme is utilized in the communication system (see paragraph [0010- 0013]).

See the Office Action at page 2 (with emphasis). The Applicant respectfully disagrees. The Office Action relies for support on the Abstract, FIGS. 1b and 6, and paragraphs 0016-0017, 0024, and 0046-0053 of Kim.

The Applicant points out that FIG. 6 of Kim (described at paragraphs 0024 and 0053) relates to code complementary keying (CCK) keyword **estimation**. FIG. 6 of Kim, or any of the remaining figures for that matter, does not relate to removing post-cursor inter-symbol interference (ISI) within an error correction code word, as recited in Applicant's claim 1. In fact, apart from the process of codeword estimation, Kim is silent with regard to any other processing (including removing of post-cursor ISI) as it relates to error correction code word in a block code based error correction scheme. In fact, the Examiner has not provided any support that Kim even relates to a block code based error correction scheme.

In this regard, Kim does not disclose or suggest at least the limitation of "removing post cursor inter-symbol interference within at least one error correction code word in a block code based error correction scheme," as recited by the Applicant in independent claim 1.

Accordingly, independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Kim and is allowable. Independent claims 6 and 11 are similar in many respects to the method disclosed in independent claim 1. Therefore, the Applicant submits that independent claims 6 and 11 are also allowable over the references cited in the Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1.

**B. Rejection of Dependent Claims 2-3, 5, 7-8, 10, 12-13, and 15-16**

Based on at least the foregoing, the Applicant believes the rejection of independent claims 1, 6 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kim has been overcome and requests that the rejection be withdrawn. Additionally, claims 2-3, 5, 7-8, 10, 12-13, and 15-16 depend from independent claims 1, 6 and 11, and are, consequently, also respectfully submitted to be allowable.

The Applicant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claims 2-3, 5, 7-8, 10, 12-13, and 15-16.

**II. Rejection of Dependent Claims 4, 9, and 14**

Based on at least the foregoing, the Applicant believes the rejection of independent claims 1, 6 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kim has been overcome and requests that the rejection be withdrawn. Additionally, since the additional cited reference (Yen) does not overcome the deficiencies of Kim, claims 4, 9, and 14 depend from independent claims 1, 6, and 11, respectively, and are, consequently, also respectfully submitted to be allowable.

The Applicant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claims 4, 9, and 14.

**III. Rejection of Dependent Claim 17**

Based on at least the foregoing, the Applicant believes the rejection of independent claims 1, 6 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kim has been overcome and requests that the rejection be withdrawn. Additionally, since the additional cited reference (Wei) does not overcome the deficiencies of Kim, claim 17 depends from independent claim 11, and is, consequently, also respectfully submitted to be allowable.

The Applicant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claim 17.

**CONCLUSION**

Based on at least the foregoing, the Applicant believes that all claims 1-17 are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner disagrees, the Applicant respectfully requests a telephone interview, and requests that the Examiner telephone the undersigned Attorney at (312) 775-8176.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to the deposit account of McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd., Account No. 13-0017.

A Notice of Allowability is courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 09-JAN-2009

/Ognyan I. Beremski/

Ognyan Beremski, Esq.  
Registration No. 51,458  
Attorney for Applicant

McANDREWS, HELD & MALLOY, LTD.  
500 WEST MADISON STREET, 34TH FLOOR  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60661  
(312) 775-8000

/OIB